

Serial No.: 10/017,241  
Attorney Docket No.: F-409

Patent

## REMARKS

### 1. Status of Claims

Claims 1-29 were pending in the Application. Applicants have amended claims 3, 7, 9, and 23 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants submit that no new matter is added. Applicants respectfully request entry of the above amendments and consideration of the enclosed remarks. Accordingly, claims 1-29 will remain pending in the application.

### 2. Rejections under 35 USC § 112

In section 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 7 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention in the use of the term "likelihood."

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. However, solely in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claims 7 and 23 without prejudice or disclaimer to recite "a score relating to." Applicants respectfully submit that amended claims 7 and 23 comply with 35 USC 112. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

### 3. Rejections under 35 USC § 102(e)

In section 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7-21 and 23-29 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0065891 A1 by Malik ("Malik '891").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 recites:

1. A method for correcting an e-mail address, the method comprising:

parsing a domain portion of the e-mail address;  
identifying a format requirement corresponding to the domain portion in a domain name database; and

Serial No.: 10/017,241  
Attorney Docket No.: F-409

Patent

providing a format suggestion based on the identified format.  
(emphasis added).

Malik '891 does not teach or fairly suggest identifying a format requirement. Malik '891 describes providing a spell check on a proposed destination email domain name address, but does not use that address to determine a formatting requirement. Even when Malik '891 describes a look-up check for a unique identifier portion of an address, there is no discussion of an abstract format rule applied to addresses at a particular domain. The Examiner provides no rational basis for interpreting the description of Malik '891 as teaching any appreciation of abstract formatting conventions as requirements.

Regarding claim 2, Malik '891 does not teach or describe an identified format requirement and certainly does not teach determining consistency with such a requirement.

Regarding claims 3 and 9, Applicants have amended the claim to clarify that the addressee information is in addition to the email address.

Regarding claim 4, Malik describes only usernames which are part of the e-mail address and does not teach or fairly suggest using a name or information in addition to the e-mail address.

Regarding claim 5, Malik '891 does not teach or suggest using a person's name, such as the first and last names described in the specification, but rather Malik '891 describes only a username lookup without any description of first or last names..

Regarding claim 7, Malik '891 describes removing domain names that have been infrequently used as determined by referring to frequency of use data and certainly does not teach or fairly suggest "utilizing a statistical frequency of the known names to determine a score relating to whether the identifier portion is consistent with one or more known names under the identified format requirement."

Regarding claim 10, Malik '891 does not discuss in any way the name of an addressee, but describes only usernames.

Serial No.: 10/017,241  
Attorney Docket No.: F-409

Patent

Regarding claim 11, Malik '891 describes gathering domain and email address usage data, not addressee information. Claim 12 is patentable over the cited reference for at least the reasons stated above with reference to claim 1.

Claims 13, 16-21 and 23-29 are not separately addressed by the Examiner and are patentable for at least the same reasons described above.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-5, 7-21 and 23-29 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

#### **4. Rejections under 35 USC § 103(a)**

In section 41 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 6 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly rendered obvious by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0065891 A1 by Malik ("Malik '891") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,829,607 to Tafoya, et al. ("Tafoya '607").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Claims 6 and 12 are patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons stated above with reference to the independent and any intermediate claims. Furthermore, in direct contradiction to the Examiner's assertion, Tafoya '607 describes only comparing a single string as input to both first and last names and does not describe comparing two sub-portions of the string and certainly not comparing a first sub-portion to first names and a second sub-portion to last names.

Applicants respectfully submit that the invention as presently claimed in claims 6 and 22 is patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 6 and 22 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-29 are in condition for allowance.

Serial No.: 10/017,241  
Attorney Docket No.: F-409

Patent

**5. Conclusion Of Remarks**

For at least the reasons stated above, it is respectfully submitted that the claims of this application are in condition for allowance and early and favorable action thereon is requested.

If the Examiner believes that additional issues may be resolved by a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney for Applicant at (203) 924-3180.

**6. Authorization**

No fee is believed due with this response. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for the response or credit any overpayment to the Pitney Bowes, Inc. Deposit Account Number 16-1885, Order No. F-409.

In the event that an extension of time or additional extension of time is required to make this response timely filed, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to the Pitney Bowes, Inc. Deposit Account Number 16-1885, Order No. F-409.

Respectfully submitted,

  
George M. Macdonald  
Reg. No. 39,284  
Attorney for Applicants  
Telephone (203) 924-3180

PITNEY BOWES INC.  
Intellectual Property and Technology Law Department  
35 Waterview Drive, P.O. Box 3000  
Shelton, CT 06484-8000